

CI-GEF PROJECT AGENCY PROJECT SAFEGUARDS SCREENING FORM

The CI-GEF Project Agency undertakes environmental screening of each proposed project to determine whether an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) is required and if so, the appropriate extent and type of ESIA. The CI-GEF Project Agency classifies the proposed project into one of three categories, depending on the type, location, sensitivity, and scale of the project and the nature and magnitude of its potential environmental impacts. The descriptions of the categories are found in the Appendix section (Paragraph 8).

All proposed activities will undergo screening to determine eligibility under GEF and CI policies, the type of ESIA that they are subject to and assess if the proposed project activities trigger any of the GEF Safeguards.

The Executing Entity is responsible for providing response to each of the questions outlined in this form when submitting a Project Identification Form (PIF) to the Project Agency for consideration.

The Project Agency is responsible for conducting all aspects of the screening process, from initiation to making the final decision on whether or not an ESIA is necessary and, if so, at what level along with whether a project-level plan is required if a safeguard is triggered.

I. PROJECT DATA SUMMARY		
Country: Japan	CI Project ID:	
Project Title: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management in Priority Socio Ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes	GEF Project ID: 5784	
Name of the Executing Entity(ies): Conservation International Japan (Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) and United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS) will also play major part in the implementation)		
Length of Project: 48 months	Start date: tbd	End date: tbd
<p>Introduction: (location, main issues to be addressed by project)</p> <p>This is a global project on mainstreaming conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in landscape and seascale management, particularly in socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes (SEPLS). SEPLS are home to rich biodiversity and underpin the effectiveness of protected areas in biodiversity conservation, but are rapidly being altered, deteriorated, or lost globally. This project addresses promotion of SEPLS by site-based projects, knowledge generation and tool production, and knowledge- and experience-sharing activities.</p>		
<p>Project Background: (description of physical, biological and socioeconomic context)</p> <p>While global conservation initiatives typically focus on protection of pristine natural areas and other high conservation value areas, designating protected areas alone cannot be expected to ensure global biodiversity. The sustainable management of cultivated systems, secondary forests and other production landscapes is essential to maintaining biodiversity levels outside of</p>		

protected areas while also providing for vital connectivity between such areas. Today, cultivated systems cover 24% of the global terrestrial surface (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005) and include all the earth's cropland, shifting cultivation, confined livestock production, and freshwater aquaculture together.

In 2010, the International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative (IPSI) was launched by 51 founding members in order to maintain or enhance biodiversity levels in environments that are “human-influenced” although not “human-dominated”, the latter including industrial or monoculture farms that are of little value to biodiversity. These human-influenced environments, in which human activities and nature co-exist, are termed “socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes” (SEPLS). The term is meant to highlight the important role that social and ecological factors play in shaping and sustaining areas where production activities are undertaken.

SEPLS can be found around the world and recognized by a variety of names—muyong in the Philippines, kebun in Indonesia and Malaysia, mauel in Korea, dehesa in Spain, and terroir in France and satoyama in Japan. They represent dynamic mosaics of habitats and land uses where harmonious interaction between people and nature maintains biodiversity while providing humans with the goods and services needed for their livelihoods, survival and well-being.

A frequently observed factor in SEPLS management, particularly in developing countries, is the continuing importance of traditional knowledge, which has historically sustained—and continues to sustain—these landscapes and seascapes, often in combination with modern practices. Identifying opportunities for merging traditional and modern approaches is critical not only for promoting culturally sensitive—and effective—sustainable management, but also for safeguarding the traditional knowledge systems that may otherwise be lost.

SEPLS make significant contributions to the achievement of conserving globally significant biodiversity and national sustainable development objectives. They provide important habitat and connectivity for genes, species and ecosystems. However, these landscapes and seascapes—and the sustainable practices and knowledge they embody—are increasingly threatened. Measures are urgently needed to conserve and ensure the sustainability of these human-influenced natural environments, particularly in areas with globally significant biodiversity.

The threats to biodiversity in SEPLS vary greatly from region to region. The primary threat is from conversion due to rapid urbanization and development. However, biodiversity is also being lost due to overuse, land marginalization, and ultimately land abandonment. Land degradation is often avoidable by applying traditional knowledge to the socio-ecological landscapes, yet traditional methods of agriculture are increasingly eschewed as societies shift to intensive production methods and volumes. Once traditional practices disappear, they may be lost forever.

Biodiversity loss in SEPLS often occurs as a result of a shift to monocultural cultivation. Increased use of agricultural chemicals and fertilizers leads to greater environmental loads, resulting in a further reduction in species diversity, as well as reduced capacity to adapt to changes and disturbances. In the face of projected climate change and current weather anomalies,

SEPLS converted to monoculture are particularly vulnerable to becoming inhospitable landscapes.

Underlying causes of biodiversity loss in SEPLS include poverty and rapidly expanding populations in urban areas, which have dramatically increased the demand for fuel and food production in peri-urban areas where SEPLS are dominant. Urbanization, industrialization, aging societies and rural depopulation have changed the balance between people and nature, resulting in the decline of many SEPLS as people migrate to cities. The combined pressures of population and urbanization, although site- and culture-specific, have eroded the sustainability and ecosystem services of SEPLS, with an adverse effect on biodiversity.

There are a number of barriers hindering the goal of ensuring ongoing conservation and sustainable use of SEPLS. Ecosystem services are often ignored in economic decision making, including land use planning. The values of ecosystem services are rarely considered in economic decision-making, partly due to difficulties in quantifying these values. Often, the ecosystem service values of SEPLS are unknown to decision-makers and stakeholders until these services are gone, as in the case of a cloud forest that condenses moisture on its leaves, filters groundwater, and helps to prevent erosion, yet which is only valued for its timber.

An additional barrier, nearly universal across SEPLS regardless of location, is the insufficient recognition of their value—particularly that of the sustainable practices and the traditional knowledge that they support. There is also an inherent difficulty in sharing traditional knowledge among SEPLS, due to the site-specific nature of traditional techniques. These challenges underlie the relative lack of financial mechanisms to “reward” caretakers of the landscapes or seascapes, who provide many benefits to people living outside of their immediate area. While some useful attempts are being made, private sector involvement in these schemes is also limited. Such policies require extensive political will, together with a progressive society that is not steeped in poverty. In general, whenever there are income disparities between rural and urban livelihoods, SEPLS are prone to be selected against.

Project Objectives:

To mainstream conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services, while improving human well-being in priority Socio-Ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS)

Project Components and Main Activities:

There are three components under this project.

Component 1 will focus on field-level demonstration activities to be implemented at SEPLS. On-the-ground activities at ten or more selected sites will aim to improve the status of the targeted SEPLS. Lessons from these activities will also be captured and incorporated into a developing knowledge base for improved management of SEPLS (see Component 2). The critical roles of indigenous peoples, women and other vulnerable groups in SEPLS will gain further recognition and respect through the activities of these demonstrations.

Component 2 will generate and synthesize knowledge related to SEPLS management. It will help to document and disseminate good practices, including traditional knowledge and practices of

indigenous peoples and local communities, for management of SEPLS, before they are lost. This knowledge will be brought together with modern management techniques to create best practice guidelines and tools for mainstreaming conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into the management of SEPLS. Site-level knowledge will be generated from three main sources: (i) pilot demonstration sites (see Component 1); (ii) IPSI member case studies, and (iii) global priority SEPLS (see Output 2.1). In addition to being made available online and other innovative tools, knowledge products will be disseminated and used as the basis for capacity building under Component 3.

Component 3 is designed to raise awareness and build capacities of key national and international level decision makers, practitioners and other stakeholders regarding the importance of SEPLS, as a key step in encouraging national-level action for sustainable use of biodiversity and mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes. Through a series of thematic regional and global workshops, stakeholders will share experiences and lessons learned, while exchanging and building knowledge on key mainstreaming themes

Compliance with Environmental Conventions:

Explain how your project's objectives, outcomes and outcomes align with the main conventions that CI adheres to. These include UNCBD, UNFCCC, RAMSAR Convention, CITES, and UNCCD.

Satoyama Initiative and IPSI are consistent with the Convention of Biological Diversity, as recognized in the COP Decisions:

- In 2010, CBD COP Decision X/32 recognized the potential usefulness of the Satoyama Initiative for better understanding and supporting human-influenced natural environments for the benefit of biodiversity and human well-being, and invited Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to participate in IPSI.
- In 2012, CBD COP Decision XI/25 recognized the work of the Satoyama Initiative in creating synergies among relevant initiatives. These decisions demonstrate the consistency of the Satoyama Initiative on which this project is based, with the CBD. Furthermore, the project contributes to achieving multiple Aichi Biodiversity Targets as shown in Section 5, Global Environmental Benefits.

Compliance with Country Legal and Institutional Frameworks:

1. Explain how your project aligns with national laws and/or frameworks related to the environment (this may include national ESIA or EIA laws, etc.)

This is a global project. The country that may participate in the project will be selected from GEF BD eligible countries. Compliance issues will be addressed when participating countries/projects are selected.

2. When national legal and institutional frameworks are inadequate, the proposal is to include a statement explaining how this problem will be addressed, either as part of the project or by a third party.
see above

3. When national legal and institutional frameworks do not apply to or impact the project and its objectives, the reason for that conclusion need to be stated.
see above

Project Justification (e.g. Alignment with Country and CI Institutional Priorities, GEF Focal Area Strategies):

This project is consistent with the Biodiversity Focal Area Objective 2 Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors. The

project is in line with Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks.

The project will contribute to the GEF focal area objective and outcome through the mainstreaming of conservation and sustainable management of biodiversity and ecosystem services, while improving human well-being in socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes. Through the provision of grants, the proposed project will support national governments, civil society organizations, community-based organizations and research institutions to develop SEPLS demonstration projects for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. The wide range of mainstreaming circumstances that the project is expected to encounter—both directly through its demonstration efforts and indirectly through its convening and knowledge and exchange roles—will allow it to generate and share important lessons and approaches to inform future work under BD-2. Conversely, the platform being strengthened by the project will strongly enable the dissemination of lessons from other BD-2 projects. This cross fertilization represents an important benefit from the perspective of GEF.

In addition, the project will contribute to the second objective of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), i.e., sustainable use of biodiversity, and to at least nine of Aichi Biodiversity Targets; namely sustainable production and consumption, fisheries and agriculture and forestry (Targets 4, 6, 7); improving and expanding protected areas (11); agro-biodiversity (13); ecosystem services and restoration (14, 15); traditional knowledge (18) and knowledge and science (19).

Estimated Appraisal Date:

GEF Focal Area: Biodiversity

GEF Project Amount: USD 1,909,000

Other Financing Amounts by Source: 5,800,000

Screening Form Prepared by: Yoji Natori, Ecosystem Policy Manager, Conservation International Japan

Date of preparation: May 11, 2014

Comments:

II. PROJECT ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONS

Answer the following questions to determine if the project is eligible for CI-GEF funding	Yes	No
1. Will the project create significant destruction of critical natural habitats ¹ of any type (forests, wetlands, grasslands, coastal/marine ecosystems, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Will the project carry out unsustainable harvesting of natural resources (animals, plants, timber	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

¹ Habitats considered essential for biodiversity conservation, provision of ecosystem services and the well-being of people at the local, national, regional or global levels. They include, among others, existing protected areas, areas officially proposed as protected areas, areas recognized as protected by traditional local communities, as well as areas identified as important for conservation (Key Biodiversity Areas [KBAs], Alliance for Zero Extinction [AZE] Sites, areas identified as important for ecosystem services such as carbon storage, freshwater provision and regulation, etc.).

and/or NTFPs) or the establishment of forest plantations in critical natural habitats		
3. Will the project include the construction and/or operation of dams?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Will the project cause the involuntary resettlement of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Will the project cause the removal, alteration or disturbance of any physical cultural resources or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. Will the project intend to procure products that are in the World Health Organization (WHO) Classes IA and IB, or formulations of products in Class II or pesticides or other chemicals specified as persistent organic pollutants under the Stockholm Convention or that are banned in the host country? Please check the WHO website for more information (http://www.who.int)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Will the project activities contravene major international and regional conventions on environmental issues?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

III. PROJECT ELEGIBILITY ASSESSMENT

If you answer **YES** to any of the questions above, your project **IS NOT ELIGIBLE** for funding

If you answer **NO** to all of the questions above, please proceed to answer the safeguard questions below

IV. SAFEGUARD QUESTIONS

The sections below will help the CI-GEF Project Agency to determine whether your project triggers any of the CI-GEF safeguard policies. As a Project Agency implementing GEF funding, CI is required to assess all applications to determine if safeguards are triggered, and if so, whether or not appropriate mitigation measures are included in project design and implementation. Based on CI's mission, CI will automatically reject projects that trigger the Safety of Dams safeguard. For further information on CI application of safeguards please refer the Appendix section of this form.

SECTION 1: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (ESIA)

Has a full or limited ESIA that covers the proposed project already been completed?

NO → Continue to Section 2 (do not fill out Table 1.1 below)

YES → No further environmental and social assessment is required **if** the existing documentation meets the CI-GEF Project Agency "Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF)" policies and standards, and environmental and social management recommendations and/or plans are integrated into the project. Therefore, you should undertake the following steps to complete this screening process:

1. Use Table 1.1 below to assess existing documentation. (It is recommended that this assessment be undertaken jointly by the CI-GEF Project Agency and the Executing Entity);
2. Ensure that the development of the full Project Document incorporates the recommendations made in the existing ESIA; and
3. Submit this template, along with other relevant documentation to the Project Agency.

TABLE 1.1: CHECKLIST FOR APPRAISING QUALITY ASSURANCE OF EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (ESIA)

1. Is the assessment a:		
<input type="checkbox"/> A FULL ESIA		
<input type="checkbox"/> A LIMITED ESIA	Yes	No
2. Does the assessment meet its terms of reference, both procedurally and substantively?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Does the assessment provide a satisfactory assessment of the proposed project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Does the assessment contain the information required for decision-making?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Does the assessment describe specific environmental and social management measures (e.g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

avoidance, minimization, mitigation, compensation, monitoring, and capacity development measures)?		
6. Does the assessment identify capacity needs of the institutions responsible for implementing environmental and social management issues?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Was the assessment developed through a consultative process with key stakeholder engagement, including issues related to gender mainstreaming?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Does the assessment assess the adequacy of the cost of and financing arrangements for environmental and social management issues?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. For any "no" answers, describe below how the issue has been or will be resolved or addressed		

SECTION 2: PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS

Will the project cause or facilitate any significant loss or degradation to critical natural habitats, and their associated biodiversity and ecosystem functions/services?

NO → Continue to Section 3

YES → Continue to Table 2.1. below

TABLE 2.1: CHECKLIST FOR PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS	Yes	No
1. Is the project located near or in existing protected areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:</i>		
a. Name, extent, category, governance arrangement, and current management of protected areas being affected by the project:		
b. Description of project activities that will affect existing protected areas:		
2. Is the project located within any other type of critical natural habitat?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:</i>		
a. Description of the critical natural habitat to be affected by the project:		
b. Description of project activities that will affect critical natural habitats:		
3. Will the project affect species identified as threatened at the local and/or global levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:

a. Name and conservation status of the species that will be affected by the project:

b. Description of project activities that will affect threatened/endangered species:

4. Will the project implement habitat restoration activities:

If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:

a. Type and extent of habitats to be restored:

b. Description of project activities for habitat restoration:

c. Description of the contribution of the project in restoring or improving ecosystem composition, structure, and functions/services:

SECTION 3: VOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT AND RESTRICTIONS TO ACCESS/USE OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Will the project involve the voluntary resettlement of people and/or direct or indirect restrictions of access to and use of natural resources?

NO → Continue to Section 4

YES → Continue to Table 3.1. below

TABLE 3.1: CHECKLIST FOR VOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT	Yes	No
1. Will the project involve the <u>voluntary</u> resettlement of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:</i>		
a. Name of communities, ethnicity, and estimated number of people to be resettled:		
b. Means by which the community(ies) provided or will provide consent for the resettlement:		
c. Description of the activities that will be carried out for the resettlement:		
2. Will the project introduce displacement measures to remove or restrict people from accessing or using resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:

- a. Name, tenure status, type of use and extent (quantity) of the resources being used:

- b. Description of project activities that will affect access to natural resources and their potential positive and negative impacts on the environment and people:

- c. Means by which the community(ies) provided or will provide consent for the restriction to access and use resources:

- d. How displaced people will be compensated?:

SECTION 4: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES ²

Does the project plan to work in lands or territories traditionally owned, customarily used, or occupied by indigenous peoples?

- NO** → Continue to Section 5
- YES** → Continue to Table 4.1. below

TABLE 4.1: CHECKLIST FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES	Yes	No
1. Will the project activities directly or indirectly affect indigenous peoples?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

² According to CI Policy on Indigenous Peoples, “CI identifies indigenous peoples in specific geographic areas by the presence, in varying degrees, of: a) Close attachment to ancestral and traditional or customary territories and the natural resources in them; b) Customary social and political institutions; c) Economic systems oriented to subsistence production; d) An indigenous language, often different from the predominant language; and f) Self-identification and identification by others as members of a distinct cultural group”.

If your answer was yes, please provide the following information when applicable:

a. Name of communities, ethnicity, estimated number of people to be affected by the project:

The information on communities, including ethnicity and number of people affected is not available at this stage. Such information will become available as project proposals are received in response to the call for proposals under Component 1.

b. Description of the project activities and their impacts on indigenous peoples:

By the nature of socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes (SEPLS), projects funded under Component 1 can involve indigenous peoples' lands. Possible or expected activities include trainings for livelihood improvement and better land management, introduction of payment for ecosystem service scheme, interviews to document traditional uses of landscapes and seascapes, and others.

The regional and global workshops (Component 3) will invite representatives from indigenous communities to share their experiences.

c. Means by which the project will respect free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) with the affected communities:

The project selection committee will require description of FPIC process in the applications and project plans.

d. Description of the approach to be implemented to ensure that that indigenous peoples receive culturally appropriate benefits that are negotiated and agreed upon with them:

To be dealt with on case-by-case basis. The project application criteria will require description of such approaches, where relevant. Where appropriate and necessary, the project will seek support of IPSI members, particularly its Steering Committee members, in ensuring that appropriate benefit sharing is done.

e. Description of the approach to be implemented to ensure the fair participation of indigenous people in the design and implementation of the project:

Same as in d. above.

SECTION 5: PEST MANAGEMENT

Does the project plan to implement activities related to agricultural extension services including the use of approved pesticides (including insecticides and herbicides) or invasive species management?

NO → Continue to Section 6

YES → Continue to Table 5.1. below

TABLE 5.1: CHECKLIST FOR PEST MANAGEMENT	Yes	No
1. Will the project include the use of approved pesticides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:

- a. Name, description and proposed use of approved pesticides:

- b. Description of how the Executing Entity will conduct the assessment of the nature and degree of associated risks, taking into account the proposed use and intended users:

- c. Description of how the Executing Entity will train communities to responsibly manage products, equipment, and containers to avoid harm to human health or broader environmental contamination:

- d. Description of how the Executing Entity will avoid the use of herbicides and pesticides near water sources and their contamination with pesticide residues when cleaning the equipment used:

- e. Description of how the Executing Entity will ensure that pesticides used would be properly applied, stored, and disposed of, in accordance with practices acceptable to the CI-GEF Project Agency:

2. Will the project include the use of ecologically-based biological/environmental integrated pest management practices (IPM) and/or Integrated Vector Management (IVM)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------

If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:

- a. Description of approach to be used:

- b. Description of potential positive and negative impacts of the approach to be used in the project:

- d. Description of how the Executing Entity will assess the risk of the danger to non-target species:

- e. Description of how the Executing Entity will train communities to responsibly implement these approaches:

SECTION 6: PHYSICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Does the project plan to remove, alter or disturb any physical cultural resources (PCRs)³?

NO → Continue to Section 7

YES → Continue to Table 6.1. below

TABLE 6.1: CHECKLIST FOR PHYSICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES (PCR)	Yes	No
1. Will the project plan to work in areas that fall into categories under PCR, including archaeological, paleontological, historical, architectural, and sacred sites including graveyards, burial sites, and sites with unique natural values?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:</i></p> <p>a. Name and description of the known physical cultural resources to be affected by the project:</p> <p>b. Description of project activities to be implemented and their positive and negative impacts on PCRs:</p> <p>c. Description of the mitigating measures to be implemented by the Executing Entity:</p> <p>d. Description of how the Executing Entity will handle issues related to consultations, siting, change-finds procedures, construction contracts and buffer zones:</p>		

SECTION 7: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1. Stakeholders Participation: Describe any stakeholders important to the project and how you have involved or plan to involve them in the planning and implementation of the project.

The GEF project is being prepared in coordination among Conservation International Japan, the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) and United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS), all of whom play important coordinating roles in IPSI. Together, they will ensure that a wide range of stakeholders, including government, private sector, indigenous peoples, and womens’ groups, are consulted during the project preparation process and fully engaged in project implementation.

IPSI members, including but not limited to, members of its Steering Committee, are key stakeholders in the project. IPSI members include a wide range of governmental and non governmental bodies—national and local governments, other government-affiliated

³ PCRs are defined as movable or immovable objects, sites, structures, and natural features and landscapes that have archeological, paleontological, historical, architectural, religious, aesthetic, sacred sites or other cultural significance.
CI-GEF Project Agency – Project Safeguard Screening Form
Last update: February 28, 2013 - MMorales

organizations, NGOs and other civil society organizations, indigenous and local community organizations, academic, educational, and research institutes, industry and private sector bodies, and international organizations such as UN agencies. These stakeholders have in common the fact that their work involves, at some level, the mainstreaming of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into production landscapes. They will be informed and consulted during project preparation and implementation and updated on the project status.

Gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment is an important aspect of this project, not only through the demonstration projects but also in its capacity development and knowledge exchange elements. Gender is one of the key criteria for selecting site level projects under component 1. The selected projects will ensure adequate gender analysis, gender sensitive indicators and sex-disaggregated data are implemented and developed. Gender balance will be considered and ensured through training and other capacity development opportunities under component 3. Further, project management, including staffing will provide appropriate consideration on gender balance and skills.

2. External Assumptions: Describe any important external factors (risks) that may affect your project during implementation and how you will mitigate these potential risks.

Sustainability of the IPSI network:

- As IPSI has been led and relied on financial resources by the initiative of the Government of Japan (namely the Ministry of the Environment), work closely with United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (IPSI secretariat) and the Ministry of the Environment of Japan to generate synergies for the on-going IPSI activities to sustain support from the Japanese government
- Diversify funding sources
- Generate and deliver outcomes that are useful for the objectives of the individual members (and other stakeholders) so that there will be incentive for them to contribute financially

Increased pressure for un-sustainable land uses:

- Work with other development/conservation institutions to support policy development by host country governments to regulate un-sustainable land use, through the capacity development component.
- Support development of alternative livelihood options through the mainstreaming component, including early demonstration of economic benefits through the SATOYAMA approach.

Weak understanding and knowledge by, and/or weak capacity of SEPLS stakeholders on sustainable SEPLS management:

- Flexible implementation of the capacity development component to effectively support capacity development of potential partner(s).

- Pursue collaboration with other development/ conservation aid institutions and programs to explore capacity development opportunities that cannot be covered by the project ' s component.

Lack of land tenure policies in potential grant sites that block implementation of sustainable SEPLS management:

- The project will work closely with government agencies and stakeholders in the grant sites, as well as to support grantees facing land tenure issues, to develop enabling environment for co-working amongst stakeholders to generate multi-stakeholder project implementation team

Weak enforcement of conservation in adjacent protected areas:

- Advise grantees under Component 1 to strengthen information exchange with local authorities and communities to know the state of enforcement at early stage of planning and incorporate components to address drivers of encroachment within the project if appropriate
- Work with other development/conservation aid institutions to support local authorities in strengthening enforcement

Change in policies in institutions providing co-financing:

- Continue close information exchange on the project and develop/strengthen sense of ownership within the institution
- Advise executing agency on diversification of its resources

Climate change impacting agriculture, forestry, fisheries production:

- Incorporate climate change risks into project planning, especially when prioritizing target geographies
- Collect, analyze, and share cases of SEPLS in geographies where impact of climate change especially on biological resource production is eminent
- Advise grantees under Component 1 to incorporate climate change risks into their long term planning, including incorporating adaptation measures

Excessive expectation by local stakeholders:

- Involve local stakeholders from early stage of the project planning and implementation and communicate the purpose, strategies, means, and timeframe of the project clearly to avoid any possible misunderstanding of the project
- Practice Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)

3. Long-term Sustainability/Replicability: Describe how project components or results will continue or be replicated beyond the initial project. Note that this may include elements of project design, tools utilized during the project, or project results.

Ensuring sustainability of activities initiated by the project funded will be an important consideration in

<p>Component 1. Early and effective involvement of local stakeholder where projects will be conducted will increase the likelihood of the sustainability of the project activities. Information generated will be shared among wide and diverse audiences, including, but not limited to, IPSI members, participants to the regional and global workshops, and through internet. Since one of the objective of Satoyama Initiative is to promote sustainable use of SEPLS, such amplification activity is critical and will be actively pursued. Bymaking the results of the project shared widely, long-term sustainability and replicability are expected to be achieved.</p>
<p>4. Social Context: Describe the broad socio-economic context of, and local communities living in, the area of the proposed project. Project Background in Section I has described the social context at the global level.</p>
<p>5. Describe how the project will work in this context and with the local communities, if relevant. The project will invite proposals to engage and implement activities at more local levels. All proposals that will be selected to be funded will be consistent with the objectives of the onservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in general, and with the Satoyama Initiative in particular.</p>
<p>6. Gender mainstreaming: Describe how the Executing Entity will ensure that gender issues are mainstreaming throughout the project, according to CI policies. As described above, gender mainstreaming and women’s empowerment is an important aspect of this project, not only through the demonstration projects but also in its capacity development and knowledge exchange elements. Gender is one of the key criteria for selecting site level projects under component 1. The selected projects will ensure adequate gender analysis, gender sensitive indicators and sex-disaggregated data are implemented and developed. Gender balance will be considered and ensured through training and other capacity development opportunities under component 3. Further, project management, including staffing will provide appropriate consideration on gender balance and skills.</p>

APPENDIX

CI-GEF PROJECT AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK (ESMF)

I. INTRODUCTION

1. CI's mission is to improve human well-being through more responsible and sustainable management of nature, including biodiversity. Recognizing the value of safeguards for risk management as well as CI's responsibility as a partner of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), CI as a GEF Project Agency has adopted the GEF Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards and Gender Mainstreaming⁴, and will screen projects for all such potential impacts. If CI-GEF projects are assessed as having minor adverse impacts, these projects may be approved, provided that they include appropriate mitigation and compensation measures and are in overall accordance with GEF and CI policies and principles. CI considers the roles of men and women in all aspects of our business decision making, and in all of our projects, we will use a gender mainstreaming approach to ensure gender equality and equity are achieved in our target sites as a cornerstone of our conservation efforts.

II. PURPOSE

2. The purpose of the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) is to ensure that adverse environmental and social impacts are avoided or, when unavoidable, minimized and appropriately mitigated and/or compensated. The ESMF is based on the GEF's minimum standards for environmental and social safeguards as well as current CI policies and international best practices.
3. A key principle of the ESMF is to prevent, minimize and mitigate any harm to the environment and to people by incorporating environmental and social concerns as an intrinsic part throughout the project cycle. Any identified adverse environmental and social impacts will be addressed and tracked throughout all stages of the project cycle to ensure that supported activities comply with the policies and practices laid out in the ESMF.

III. CI-PROJECT AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

4. As a GEF Project Agency, CI must ensure that CI-GEF projects comply with the GEF Minimum Standards for Environmental and Social Safeguards as well as with the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming. Relevant CI policies and best practices for GEF funded projects are described in this section. The description of the implementation arrangements for each specific policy and more detailed description of measures to address particular issues pertaining to the respective GEF Environmental and Social Safeguards is provided in the CI-GEF Project Agency – Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) manual. Please request a copy of this document to CI if needed.

⁴ <http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/4562>

5. CI-GEF's ESMF is composed of 8 policies and 1 best practice guideline. They describe the minimum standards that each CI-GEF funded project must meet or exceed.

Policies

- Environmental and Social Impact Assessment Policy
- Protection of Natural Habitats
- Involuntary Resettlement Policy
- Indigenous Peoples Policy
- Pest Management Policy
- Physical Cultural Resources Policy
- Accountability and Grievance Systems Policy
- Gender mainstreaming Policy

Best practice

- Stakeholder Engagement Best Practice

POLICY 1: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (ESIA)

6. This policy complies with GEF Minimum Standard 1.
7. For all CI-GEF funded projects, CI will conduct an initial screening to categorize projects according to their expected impacts. The Screening outcomes may result in a project being designated as Category A (full or comprehensive ESIA required), Category B (limited ESIA required), or Category C (no ESIA required). For Category A and B projects, the ESIA will be designed to identify impacts and mitigation measures that are incorporated in project design and would result in an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF).
8. CI classifies the proposed project into one of three categories, depending on the type, location, sensitivity, and scale of the project and the nature and magnitude of its potential environmental impacts.

Category A: a proposed project is classified as Category A if it is likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts that are sensitive, diverse, or unprecedented. These impacts may affect an area broader than the sites or facilities subject to physical works (i.e. the area of influence). The ESIA for a Category A project examines the project's potential negative and positive environmental impacts, compares them with those of feasible alternatives (including the 'without project' situation), and recommends any measures needed to prevent, minimize, mitigate, or compensate for adverse impacts and improve environmental performance. For a Category A project, the project Executing Entity is responsible for making arrangements to carry out an Environmental Assessment;

Category B: a proposed project is classified as Category B if its potential adverse environmental impacts on human populations or environmentally important areas -including wetlands, forests, grasslands, and other natural habitats- are less adverse than those of Category A projects. These impacts are site-specific; few if any of them are irreversible; and in most cases mitigation measures can be designed more readily than for Category A projects. The scope of an ESIA for a

Category B project may vary from project to project, but it is narrower than an assessment for Category A. Consistent with ESIA for Category A projects, it examines the project's potential negative and positive environmental impacts and recommends any measures needed to prevent, minimize, mitigate, or compensate for adverse impacts and improve environmental performance. The findings and results of a Category B ESIA are described in the project documentation.

Category C: a proposed project is classified as Category C if it is likely to have minimal or no adverse environmental impacts. Beyond screening, no further ESIA action is required for a Category C project.

9. Since projects in Category A are likely to have significant adverse impacts, they will require a full ESIA to address them. Projects in Category B also require an ESIA, but of more limited scope given their more limited adverse impacts (limited ESIA).

10. CI has identified five types of potential adverse environmental impacts that may be associated with CI-GEF projects, arising from:
 - a) *Protected area creation, expansion or management improvement:* although desirable and often necessary for conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services, creation or expansion of protected areas carries the possibility of limiting access to natural resources and thus impacting livelihoods of local communities;
 - b) *Investment in business or livelihood development:* projects promoting development, even if they are categorized as sustainable development, green economies or low-carbon development, may have adverse impacts on species and ecosystems (e.g., wind mills on birds, ecotourism on natural habitats);
 - c) *Civil works:* some impacts may be associated with the construction or rehabilitation of facilities (e.g., roads and structures associated with park management, research facilities, and restoration-related activities or boundary markers);
 - d) *Occupational health and safety:* during construction, a project may expose workers to safety hazards (e.g. construction accidents); and
 - e) *Pest management:* some pest management activities may be supported for ecological restoration to combat pests that damage crops or invasive alien species, but unless planned and executed with care could create environmental and health risks.

11. CI may decide nonetheless to support projects that may create these types of impacts on the condition that the impacts will be limited in time and space and that benefits brought by the project activities surpass the costs. Actions to minimize and mitigate the environmental and social impacts will be included in a project's Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), (see the ESMF manual for further details).

12. The CI-GEF Project Agency Team will conduct an initial screening of project concepts and/or Project Identification Forms (PIFs) from Executing Entities. The purpose of this screening is to categorize projects according to their expected or potential impacts. This initial screening will take place on the

initial PIF and utilize a *Project Screening Form* (this form) to cover all safeguards areas. The results of the screening process will determine the extent and type of ESIA required.

13. If the results from the project screening finds that an ESIA is necessary, it will be conducted and documented as described in the CI-GEF ESMF. For CI-GEF funded projects, the CI-GEF Project Agency Team will require that an ESIA is conducted on activities related to the direct and indirect areas of influence of projects and that the ESIA will emphasize cumulative and indirect impacts.
14. Based on the results of the ESIA, the CI-GEF Project Agency Team will determine what project-level plans will be needed for the Executing Entity to proceed with project preparation. Project-level plans include an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), Pest Management Plan (PMP), and Indigenous Peoples Plan (IMP).
15. Project-level plans may also be developed even when no ESIA is necessary (no adverse impacts are expected), as a means for coordination and to promote positive impacts. All plans will be reviewed and approved by the CI-GEF Project Agency Team prior to final approval of the grant agreement by CI's Vice President for Global Public Partnerships and Chief Operating Officer.

POLICY 2: PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS

16. This policy complies with GEF Minimum Standard 2.
17. As a conservation organization, CI's strategies, policies and approaches are fully consistent with the GEF's protection of natural habitats safeguard. CI commits not to cause, or facilitate, any significant loss or degradation of natural habitats. CI finances those activities that promote protection of threatened species and their natural habitats and foster the adoption of sustainable development practices that are socially acceptable and economically feasible. CI projects promote the prevention, reduction, or reversal of habitat loss or degradation in order to conserve threatened species that depend on these habitats and the ecosystem service (ES) benefits that they provide to humans. All activities will be consistent with existing protected area management plans or other resource management strategies that are applicable to national or local situations.
18. All CI-GEF project activities will be consistent with existing protected area management plans or other resource management strategies that are applicable to local situations.
19. In order to protect the environment and in accordance with international agreements, CI endorses and applies the precautionary approach⁵ for its projects and programs. Thus, where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation. Furthermore, CI will continue to focus its work at the ecoregional level, which will ensure comprehensive and long-term conservation of biological diversity and ecosystem services at the ecoregional scale.
20. To prevent critical natural habitat destruction, fragmentation and/or degradation, CI will favor the development of physical infrastructure in areas where natural habitats have already been converted to other uses. In line with GEF requirements, CI will only finance habitat restoration projects that can demonstrate that they will restore or improve ecosystem composition, structure and functions.
21. CI will not finance projects that:

⁵ Principle 15 of the 1992 Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (Rio Declaration)
CI-GEF Project Agency – Project Safeguard Screening Form
Last update: February 28, 2013 - MMorales

- a) Propose to create significant destruction or degradation of critical natural habitats of any type (forests, wetlands, grasslands, coastal/marine ecosystems, etc.);
 - b) Propose to carry out harvesting of natural resources (animals, plants, timber and/or non-timber forest products [NTFPs]) or the establishment of forest plantations in natural critical habitats; and
 - c) Contravene major international and regional conventions on environmental issues.
22. In the development of a project, the Executing Entity should at a minimum consider both direct and indirect project-related impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems services, and identify any significant residual impacts. This process will consider relevant threats to biodiversity and ecosystem services, especially focusing on habitat loss, degradation and fragmentation, invasive alien species, overexploitation, hydrological changes, nutrient loading, and pollution. It will also take into account the differing values attached to biodiversity and ecosystem services by project-affected communities and, where appropriate, other stakeholders across the potentially affected landscape or seascape. Further, in areas of natural habitat, mitigation measures will be designed to achieve no net loss of biodiversity where feasible, following the “mitigation hierarchy:”
- a) Avoiding impacts on biodiversity through the identification and protection of set-asides;
 - b) Implementing measures to minimize habitat fragmentation, such as biological corridors;
 - c) Restoring habitats during and/or after operations; and
 - d) Implementing biodiversity offsets of like-for-like or better.
23. The ESMF manual provides more details about this policy.

POLICY 3: INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT

24. This policy complies with GEF Minimum Standard 3.
25. The CI-GEF Project Agency will not fund projects involving involuntary resettlement.
26. For projects that may include involuntary restrictions of access to natural resources resulting in adverse impacts on the livelihoods of project communities, Executing Entities will have to prepare a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) to describe the project, efforts made to minimize displacement, results from census and socioeconomic surveys, all relevant local laws and customary rights that apply, resettlement sites, income restoration institutional arrangements, implementation schedule, participation and consultation, accountability and grievance, monitoring and evaluation and costs and budgets.
27. CI policy extends to the inclusion of customary rights and not only limited to areas where there are legal rights over access and use of resources. This is based on the understanding that in some countries customary or traditional rights are fully recognized and respected, even when they are not “legal rights” (recognized by specific pieces of legislation, land title, resource use permits, etc.).
28. In addition, CI will follow national legislation on access and use of natural resources.
29. For restriction of access to natural resources, for example as a result of the creation of new protected areas, Executing Entities will be required to prepare a “Process Framework” that describes the nature of the restrictions, the participatory process by which project components will be prepared, criteria by which displaced persons are eligible, measures to restore livelihoods and

the means by which any conflicts would be resolved. A plan may also be developed during implementation providing more detail on the arrangements to assist affected persons to improve or restore their livelihoods.

30. The ESMF manual provides more details about this policy.

POLICY 4: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

31. This policy complies with GEF Minimum Standard 4.

32. Many of the world's remaining areas of high biodiversity and critical ecosystem service provision overlap with lands owned, occupied, and/or utilized by indigenous peoples. CI has engaged with indigenous peoples in a range of ecosystems and capacities from community-based work to support the sustainable and traditional uses of medicinal plants and animals to working with indigenous groups in managing traditional lands to support biodiversity conservation and ecological processes that maintain their lives and livelihoods.

33. In line with CI's Institutional Policy "Indigenous Peoples and Conservation International, the CI-GEF Project Agency will ensure:

- a) That projects respect indigenous peoples' rights, including their rights to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) processes;
- b) That they receive culturally appropriate benefits that are negotiated and agreed upon with the indigenous peoples' communities in question; and
- c) That potential adverse impacts are avoided or adequately addressed through a participatory and consultative approach.

34. Specific measures to achieve these objectives will be incorporated in the Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) developed with the indigenous peoples communities concerned (see ESMF).

35. The ESMF manual provides more details about this policy.

POLICY 5: PEST MANAGEMENT

36. This policy complies with GEF Minimum Standard 5.

37. CI promotes the use of demand driven, ecologically-based biological or environmental integrated pest management practices (IPM) and Integrated Vector Management (IVM) in public health projects.

38. CI will support policy reform and institutional capacity development to enhance implementation of IPM and IVM based pest management while regulating and monitoring the distribution of pesticides.

39. CI-GEF projects may support investments related to agricultural extension services or invasive species management.

40. CI does not allow the use of pesticides that are unlawful under national or international law.

41. CI does not allow the procurement or use in its projects pesticides and other chemicals specified as persistent organic pollutants under the Stockholm Convention nor procurement or use of products in World Health Organization (WHO) Classes IA and IB or Class II.
42. CI will promote alternatives to the use of pesticides, but when there is no alternative, it will ensure to:
 - a) Avoiding the use of pesticides with toxic categories IA IB or II (according to WHO);
 - b) Avoiding the use of herbicides and pesticides near water sources and their contamination with pesticide residues when cleaning the equipment used; and
 - c) Training communities to responsibly manage products, equipment, and containers to avoid harm to human health or broader environmental contamination. Any pesticides used would be properly applied, stored, and disposed of, in accordance with practices acceptable to CI.
43. For projects that require the procurement of eligible pesticides, CI will ensure that these pesticides are procured contingent on an assessment of the nature and degree of associated risks, taking into account the proposed use and intended users.
44. CI does not support projects that propose the introduction of species that can potentially become invasive and harmful to the environment, unless there is a mitigation plan to avoid this from happening.
45. The ESMF manual provides more details about this policy.

POLICY 6: PHYSICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

46. This policy complies with GEF Minimum Standard 6.
47. CI will not fund any activity that involves the removal, alteration or disturbance of any physical cultural resources (defined as movable or immovable objects, sites, structures, and natural features and landscapes that have archeological, paleontological, historical, architectural, religious, aesthetic, sacred sites or other cultural significance).
48. Cultural resources may, however, be present in project areas and measures should be put in place to ensure that they are identified and that adverse effects on them are avoided. This is particularly relevant for projects that support development of management plans and other land and natural resource use planning, projects that support alternative livelihood activities, and projects that include small infrastructure construction.
49. The ESMF manual includes procedures to ensure that provisions under this policy are followed.

SAFETY OF DAMS

50. As CI does not build dams, no policy has been developed for GEF Minimum Standard 7, Safety of Dams. Therefore, the CI-GEF Project Agency will not be able to propose or receive GEF Resources for any projects that design and construct new dams and rehabilitate existing dams or projects financing agriculture or water resource management infrastructure, that are highly dependent on the performance of dams or that potentially affect their performance.

POLICY 7: ACCOUNTABILITY AND GRIEVANCE MECHANISMS

51. This policy complies with GEF Minimum Standard 8.
52. CI ensures enforcement of its environmental and social safeguard policies and provides for the receipt of and timely response to/resolution of complaints from parties affected by its CI-GEF projects through the Accountability and Grievance Mechanism (see ESMF manual for more details).
53. The Accountability and Grievance Mechanism is not intended to replace project- and country-level dispute resolution and redress mechanisms. These mechanisms are designed to:
- a) Address potential breaches of CI's policies and procedures;
 - b) Be independent, transparent, and effective;
 - c) Be accessible to project-affected people;
 - d) Keep complainants abreast of progress with cases brought forward; and
 - e) Maintain records on all cases and issues brought forward for review.
54. Project-affected communities and other interested stakeholders may raise a grievance at any time to the Executing Entity, CI, or the GEF. The Executing Entity will be responsible for informing project-affected parties about the Accountability and Grievance Mechanism. Contact information of the Executing Entity, CI's Project Agency, and the GEF will be made publicly available.
55. As a first step, project-related grievances should be communicated to the Executing Entity, which will respond to grievances in writing within 15 calendar days of receipt, and provide a copy of the grievance and response to the CI-GEF Project Agency Team. This response should propose a process for resolving the conflict.
56. If this process does not result in resolution of the grievance, the grievant may file a claim with the Director of Compliance (DOC) who is responsible for the CI Accountability and Grievance Mechanism and who can be reached at:
- Electronic email:** GEFAccountability@conservation.org
- Mailing address:** Direction of Compliance
Conservation International
2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500
Arlington, VA 22202, USA.
57. The DOC will respond within 15 calendar days of receipt, and claims will be filed and included in project monitoring.
58. Projects requiring FPIC or triggering an Indigenous Peoples Plan will also include local conflict resolution and grievance redress mechanisms in the respective safeguard documents. These will be developed with the participation of the affected communities in culturally appropriate ways and will ensure adequate representation from vulnerable or marginalized groups and sub-groups.
59. The ESMF manual provides more details about this policy.

POLICY 8: GENDER MAINSTREAMING

60. This section outlines CI-GEF Project Agency policy and requirements to mainstream gender equality and equity into all project activities and operations. These are consistent with the GEF's Policies on Environmental and Social Safeguard Standards and Gender Mainstreaming.
61. CI-GEF Project Agency considers the respective roles of men and women in all aspects of the project activities, from hiring and retention to project design and implementation, as well as monitoring and evaluation, in order to promote and achieve gender equality and equity. This policy and its implementation mitigates potentially adverse effects of gender constraints on participation and decision-making in consultative processes, access to natural resources, and project benefits.
62. CI-GEF Project Agency requires Executing Entities to design and implement projects in such a way that both women and men:
- a) receive culturally compatible social and economic benefits;
 - b) do not suffer adverse effects during the development process; and
 - c) receive full respect for their dignity and human rights.
63. The Executing Entity is responsible for mainstreaming gender throughout the project, as appropriate, using qualified professionals based on-site, studies, and meetings. The plan will cover gender-sensitive activities while recognizing and respecting the different roles that women and men play in resource management and in society, along with a monitoring and evaluation plan using sex-disaggregated indicators.
64. In addition, the CI-GEF Project Agency has identified measures to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate gender-related adverse impacts. Key measures to avoid/minimize/mitigate gender adverse impacts include:
- a) All projects will include a gender mainstreaming strategy developed in consultation with CI's gender specialist and/or local organizations or groups working specifically on gender (or with women) when in development phase;
 - b) All project matrices specify gender-sensitive indicators for M&E where appropriate and qualitative and quantitative monitoring data are desegregated by men and women;
 - c) All project proposals must include an assessment of gender roles relating to the environment on which the project will be based (e.g. use patterns, participation in management, etc.) and both short term and long term costs and benefits of the project on men and women, and identify ways to minimize disparities;
 - d) Executing Entity collects sex-disaggregated data on the number of men and women who come to trainings/activities and incorporates into adaptive management;
 - e) Executing Entity establishes a baseline for gender mainstreaming performance by identifying a number of core indicators to be used in all projects;
 - f) Executing Entity ensures a proportional number of men and women respondents are included in project surveys (for design, monitoring, and evaluation);
 - g) Gender-sensitive M&E data informs programming and projects through an adaptive management project cycle; and

- h) Executing Entity ensures that outreach efforts, services, and communication (education, dissemination of survey results, trainings, etc.) are made equally available to men and women.

65. The ESMF manual provides more details about this policy.

BEST PRACTICE: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

- 66. CI's policy on stakeholder engagement for GEF funded projects is based on International Finance Corporation's (IFC) Stakeholder engagement (A good Practice Handbook for Companies doing business in Emerging Markets) and is applicable to all CI-GEF funded projects.
- 67. The Project Agency will oversee the Executing Entity involving all stakeholders, including project-affected groups, indigenous peoples, and local Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), as early as possible in the preparation process and ensure that their views and concerns are made known and taken into account.
- 68. The CI-GEF Project Agency Team will also ensure that the Executing Entity will hold and document consultations at the scoping stage for Category A projects, before appraisal for all projects and if deemed necessary throughout project implementation. The Executing Entity is responsible for drafting and executing the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. The Project agency will review the plan and oversee execution.
- 69. Ideally, Stakeholder Engagement should involve the public in problem-solving. The joint effort by stakeholders, in country representatives, executing entities, GEF Project Agency ensures better results. Executing Entities must ensure that the key principles of the GEF Gender Mainstreaming Policy is incorporated beginning with stakeholder engagement.
- 70. Stakeholder engagement usually begins before the ESIA process and extends well beyond it. For Category A projects, stakeholder engagement through consultations must occur twice. The first instance of consultation must occur at scoping where the TOR for the ESIA must be distributed to the project affected people and other stakeholders in order to receive additional requirements for the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment Report. The second instance where consultation must occur is prior to appraisal of the project by the CI-GEF Project Agency Team. In both instances, the CI-GEF Project Agency Team will require documentation of the consultations to first approve ESIA report and finally to authorize appraisal.
- 71. Once the ESIA has been completed, stakeholder engagement will focus on the implementation of the project. It is recommended that the ongoing stakeholder processes continue throughout the life of the project. The nature, frequency, and level of effort of stakeholder engagement may vary considerably and will be commensurate with the project's risks and adverse impacts, and the project's phase of development.
- 72. Executing Entities should identify the range of stakeholders that may be interested in their actions and consider how external communications might facilitate a dialog with all stakeholders. Stakeholders should be informed and provided with information regarding project activities. Where projects involve specifically identified physical elements, aspects and/or facilities that are likely to generate adverse environmental and social impacts to Affected Communities the client will identify the Affected Communities and will meet the relevant requirements described below.

73. The Executing Entity will develop and implement a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (see ESMF manual for details) that is scaled to the project risks and impacts and development stage, and be tailored to the characteristics and interests of the Affected Communities.
74. Where applicable, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan will include differentiated measures to allow the effective participation of those identified as disadvantaged or vulnerable. When the stakeholder engagement process depends substantially on community representatives, the Executing Entity will make every reasonable effort to verify that such persons do in fact represent the views of Affected Communities and that they can be relied upon to faithfully communicate the results of consultations to their constituents.
75. In cases where the exact location of the project is not known, but it is reasonably expected to have significant impacts on local communities, the Executing Entity will prepare a Stakeholder Engagement Framework, as part of its management program, outlining general principles and a strategy to identify Affected Communities and other relevant stakeholders and plan for an engagement process.
76. The Project Agency will review and approve all Stakeholder Engagement Plans prior to disclosure.

Disclosure

77. CI publicly discloses documents related to all CI-GEF Environmental and Social Safeguards and Gender policy.
78. Key documents prepared to address safeguard issues will be disclosed on CI's website at <http://www.conservation.org>.
79. Should the Executing Entity be required to develop a stand-alone an Environmental and Social Management Plan (to address Physical and Cultural Resources and Natural Habitats), an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP), a Pest Management Plan (PMP), a Process Framework, a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), these documents will be disclosed to all project affected communities, indigenous peoples and local communities in a form, manner and language appropriate for the local context. In addition, disclosure will also be made in the country of project implementation and at multiple locations within country of execution in a form, manner and language appropriate for the local context. Disclosure will occur in the following stages:
 - a) Disclosure of assessment documents (e.g., , draft Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) and draft safeguard documents (e.g. IPP) during project preparation. Disclosure during project preparation aims to seek feedback and input from indigenous peoples and local communities, and as appropriate other stakeholders, on the safeguard issues identified and the measures incorporated in project design to address them.
 - b) Disclosure of all assessments prior to project appraisal;
 - c) Disclose of all assessments have they been finalized and approved by the CI-GEF Project Agency Team (prior to project implementation); and
 - d) Ongoing disclosure during and after conclusion of project activities to inform communities of implementation activities, unexpected impacts, measures taken to address them, etc.
80. Finally, CI will disclose information on approved projects, including any safeguard issues, through its website. The website will list contact information where interested stakeholders can seek further

information or documentation and raise their concerns or recommendations to CI. Project Agency will be responsible for ensuring appropriate response.

81. The ESMF manual provides more details about this best practice.

IV. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Environmental and Social Safeguard Responsibilities

82. The **CI-GEF Project Agency Team** has the overall responsibility for ensuring that environmental and social issues are adequately addressed within the project cycle and will be ultimately responsible for the review and supervision of the implementation of safeguards.

83. The **Executing Entity/Agency** is responsible for designing executing a project consistent with the requirements of the GEF minimum standards and CI policies related to safeguards as described in this ESMF. This includes monitoring and evaluation of progress of the agreed actions that address safeguard issues during project implementation.

84. The **CI-GEF Project Agency Team** will monitor implementation of this Framework. It will review and approve key documents such as Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) terms of reference and project-specific safeguard plans and action plans developed during project implementation. During project preparation, the CI-GEF Project Agency Team will be able to request from a potential Executing Entity all information it requires concerning project effects on indigenous peoples and local communities, and require further assessment or consultations as well as work on safeguard plans until it is satisfied that the GEF minimum standards and CIs own policies have been satisfactorily addressed. CI will also review and approve any action plans developed during project implementation.

85. The **CI-GEF Project Agency Team** will also be responsible for oversight of the gender mainstreaming component of the project planning process. Through its project design review, CI will identify and promote measures to support the equal treatment of women and men, including the equal access to resources and services.

86. Throughout the project review process, the CI-GEF Project Agency Team will maintain contact with the Executing Entity to obtain clarification on information provided and the preparation process. There are two key decision points during the project preparation process. The screening of project concepts will identify potential safeguard issues and ascribe project preparation procedures to further assess potential impacts and design mitigation measures, as needed. A review of the final project proposal will, besides reviewing the proposal against CI and GEF objectives and procedures, assess the adequacy of the project's preparation process and implementation measures vis-à-vis the safeguard issues and requirements, including:

- a) Compliance with this ESMF, CI policies and commitments, and GEF environmental and social safeguard policies;
- b) Adherence to the mitigation hierarchy against possible adverse environmental impacts;
- c) Adherence to the mitigation hierarchy against possible adverse social impacts;
- d) Adequacy and feasibility of the proposed safeguard mitigation measures and monitoring plans, including any Environmental and Social Management Plan, Pest Management Plan, Involuntary Resettlement Plan, or Indigenous Peoples Plan;

- e) Adequacy of the project's consultations processes and communication of the Accountability and Grievance Mechanism;
 - f) Identification of measures to avoid, minimize, or offset adverse impacts;
 - g) Identification of measures to support the equal treatment of women and men, including the equal access to resources and services;
 - h) Capacity, including but not limited to technical and financial capacity, of the Executing Entity to implement the project and any required safeguard-related measures during the preparation and implementation of the project; and
 - i) Clear documentation of the foregoing available to stakeholders before appraisal can occur.
87. Through this review, the CI-GEF Project Agency Team may find the safeguard process and measures satisfactory, or may find the need for further discussion with, and steps by, the Executing Entity to achieve the objectives of this ESMF, including revising safeguard measures and documents as appropriate. If the costs, risks, or complexity of particular safeguard issues outweigh the expected project benefits, a decision may be taken to not support the project. For projects affecting indigenous peoples, a process to ensure their free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) is also required.
88. During project execution, safeguard compliance will be tracked along with performance toward project objectives. At each performance reporting stage, generally on a quarterly basis, the Executing Entity will revisit the safeguard issues to assess their status and address any issues that may arise. In cases where the Executing Entity is implementing an Environmental and Social Management Plan, other project-level plan, or other mitigation measures, it will report on the progress of such implementation in parallel to or as part of reporting for other project elements. The intent of this process is to ensure that the environmental and social safeguard issues, including gender equality and equity, are continually monitored and adverse effects mitigated throughout project implementation. The CI-GEF Project Agency Team will monitor the implementation of safeguards during project implementation through check-in meetings and field visits. The CI-GEF Project Agency Team will review and approve any safeguard-related action plans required prior to or developed during implementation of projects.
89. Project-specific draft plans (including mitigation plans) are to be disclosed to all stakeholders including: affected communities and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) prior to appraisal. Before plans can be disclosed; the CI-GEF Project Agency Team must review and approve draft. Executing Entities must also disclose to affected parties the final plans prior to implementation and any action plans prepared during project implementation, including gender mainstreaming. In all cases, disclosure should occur in a manner meaningful and understandable to the affected people for their consent. The CI-GEF Project Agency Team will disclose all final approved plans on CI's website.
90. The key responsibilities of the CI-GEF Project Agency Team and the Executing Entities are described in further detail in table below. Exact procedures depend on the specific project activities and the local context, for instance, the number of safeguard policies that are triggered and the level of impacts.